

Optimal Gossip-Based Aggregate Computation

Jen-Yeu Chen*

Gopal Pandurangan†

Abstract

Motivated by applications to modern networking technologies, there has been interest in designing efficient gossip-based protocols for computing aggregate functions. While gossip-based protocols provide robustness due to their randomized nature, reducing the message and time complexity of these protocols is also of paramount importance in the context of resource-constrained networks such as sensor and peer-to-peer networks.

We present the first provably almost-optimal gossip-based algorithms for aggregate computation that are both time optimal and message-optimal. Given a n -node network, our algorithms guarantee that all the nodes can compute the common aggregates (such as Min, Max, Count, Sum, Average, Rank etc.) of their values in optimal $O(\log n)$ time and using $O(n \log \log n)$ messages. Our result improves on the algorithm of Kempe et al. [9] that is time-optimal, but uses $O(n \log n)$ messages as well as on the algorithm of Kashyap et al. [8] that uses $O(n \log \log n)$ messages, but is not time-optimal (takes $O(\log n \log \log n)$ time). Furthermore, we show that our algorithms can be used to improve gossip-based aggregate computation in sparse communication networks, such as in peer-to-peer networks.

The main technical ingredient of our algorithm is a technique called *distributed random ranking (DRR)* that can be useful in other applications as well. DRR gives an efficient distributed procedure to partition the network into a forest of (disjoint) trees of small size. Since the size of each tree is small, aggregates within each tree can be efficiently obtained at their respective roots. All the roots then perform a uniform gossip algorithm on their local aggregates to reach a distributed consensus on the global aggregates.

Our algorithms are non-address oblivious. In contrast, we show a lower bound of $\Omega(n \log n)$ on the message complexity of any address-oblivious algorithm for computing aggregates. This shows that non-address oblivious algorithms are needed to obtain significantly better message complexity. Our lower bound holds regardless of the number of rounds taken or the size of the messages used. Our lower bound is the first non-trivial lower bound for gossip-based aggregate computation and also gives the first formal proof that computing aggregates is strictly harder than rumor spreading in the address-oblivious model.

Keywords: Gossip-based protocols, aggregate computation, distributed randomized protocols, probabilistic analysis, lower bounds.

*Department of Electrical Engineering, National DongHwa University, ShouFeng, Hualien 97401, Taiwan, ROC. E-mail: jenyechen@acm.org. Supported in part by NSC Grant 97-2218-E259-003.

†Division of Mathematical Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 648477, and Department of Computer Science, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912. E-mail: gopalpandurangan@gmail.com. Supported in part by NSF Award CCF-0830476.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and Previous Work

Aggregate statistics (e.g., Average, Max/Min, Sum, and, Count etc.) are significantly useful for many applications in networks [2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 24]. These statistics have to be computed over data stored at individual nodes. For example, in a peer-to-peer network, the average number of files stored at each node or the maximum size of files exchanged between nodes is an important statistic needed by system designers for optimizing overall performance [22, 25]. Similarly, in sensor networks, knowing the average or maximum remaining battery power among the sensor nodes is a critical statistic. Many research efforts have been dedicated to developing scalable and distributed algorithms for aggregate computation. Among them gossip-based algorithms [1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 12, 16, 17, 20, 23] have recently received significant attention because of their simplicity of implementation, scalability to large network size, and robustness to frequent network topology changes. In a gossip-based algorithm, each node exchanges information with a randomly chosen communication partner in each round. The randomness inherent in the gossip-based protocols naturally provides robustness, simplicity, and scalability [7, 8]. We refer to [7, 8, 9] for a detailed discussion on the advantages of gossip-based computation over centralized and deterministic approaches and their attractiveness to emerging networking technologies such as peer-to-peer, wireless, and sensor networks. This paper focuses on designing efficient gossip-based protocols for aggregate computation that have low message and time complexity. This is especially useful in the context of resource-constrained networks such as sensor and wireless networks, where reducing message and time complexity can yield significant benefits in terms of lowering congestion and lengthening node lifetimes.

Much of the early work on gossip focused on using randomized communication for rumor propagation [3, 7, 21]. In particular, Karp et al. [7] gave a rumor spreading algorithm (for spreading a single message throughout a network of n nodes) that takes $O(\log n)$ communication rounds and $O(n \log \log n)$ messages. It is easy to establish that $\Omega(\log n)$ rounds are needed by any gossip-based rumor spreading algorithm (this bound also holds for gossip-based aggregate computation). They also showed that any rumor spreading algorithm needs at least $\Omega(n \log \log n)$ messages for a class of randomized gossip-based algorithms referred to as *address-oblivious* algorithms [7]. Informally, an algorithm is called address-oblivious if the decision to send a message to its communication partner in a round does not depend on the partner's address. Karp et al.'s algorithm is address-oblivious. For non-address oblivious algorithms, they show a lower bound of $\omega(n)$ messages, if the algorithm is allowed only $O(\log n)$ rounds.

Kempe et al. [9] were the first to present randomized gossip-based algorithms for computing aggregates. They analyzed a gossip-based protocol for computing sums, averages, quantiles, and other aggregate functions. In their scheme for estimating average, each node selects another random node to which it sends half of its value; a node on receiving a set of values just adds them to its own halved value. Their protocol takes $O(\log n)$ rounds and uses $O(n \log n)$ messages to converge to the true average in a n -node network. Their protocol is address-oblivious. The work of Kashyap et al. [8] was the first to address the issue of reducing the message complexity of gossip-based aggregate protocols, even at the cost of increasing the time complexity. They presented an algorithm that significantly improves over the message complexity of the protocol of Kempe et al. Their algorithm uses only $O(n \log \log n)$ messages, but is not time optimal — it runs in $O(\log n \log \log n)$ time. Their algorithm achieves this $O(\log n / \log \log n)$ factor reduction in the number of messages by randomly clustering nodes into groups of size $O(\log n)$, selecting representative for each group, and then having the group representatives gossip among themselves. Their algorithm is not address-oblivious. For other related work on gossip-based protocols, we refer to [8, 2] and the references therein.

Table 1: DRR-gossip vs. other gossip-based algorithms.

Algorithm	time complexity	message complexity	address oblivious?
efficient gossip [8]	$O(\log n \log \log n)$	$O(n \log \log n)$	no
uniform gossip [9]	$O(\log n)$	$O(n \log n)$	yes
DRR-gossip [this paper]	$O(\log n)$	$O(n \log \log n)$	no

1.2 Our Contributions

In this paper, we present the first provably almost-optimal gossip-based algorithms for computing various aggregate functions that improves upon previous results. Given a n -node network, our algorithms guarantee that all the nodes can compute the common aggregates (such as Min, Max, Count, Sum, Average, Rank etc.) of their values in optimal $O(\log n)$ time and using $O(n \log \log n)$ messages. Our result (cf. Table 1) improves on the algorithm of Kempe et al. [9] that is time-optimal, but uses $O(n \log n)$ messages as well as on the algorithm of Kashyap et al. [8] that uses $O(n \log \log n)$ messages, but is not time-optimal (takes $O(\log n \log \log n)$ time).

Our algorithms use a simple scheme called *distributed random ranking (DRR)* that gives an efficient distributed protocol to partition the network into a forest of disjoint trees of $O(\log n)$ size. Since the size of each tree is small, aggregates within each tree can be efficiently obtained at their respective roots. All the roots then perform a uniform gossip algorithm on their local (tree) aggregates to reach a distributed consensus on the global aggregates. Our idea of forming trees and then doing gossip among the roots of the trees is similar to the idea of Kashyap et al. The main novelty is that our DRR technique gives a simple and efficient distributed way of decomposing the network into disjoint trees (groups) which takes only $O(\log n)$ rounds and $O(n \log \log n)$ messages. This leads to a simpler and faster algorithm than that of [8]. The paper of [20] proposes the following heuristic: divide the network into clusters (called the “bootstrap phase”), aggregate the data within the clusters — these are aggregated in a small subset of nodes within each cluster called clusterheads; the clusterheads then use gossip algorithm of Kempe et al to do inter-cluster aggregation; and, finally the clusterheads will disseminate the information to all the nodes in the respective clusters. It is not clear in [20] how to efficiently implement the bootstrap phase of dividing the network into clusters. Also, only numerical simulation results are presented in [20] to show that their approach gives better complexity than the algorithm of Kempe et al. It is mentioned *without proof* that their approach can take $O(n \log \log n)$ messages and $O(\log n)$ time. Hence, to the best of our knowledge, our work presents the first rigorous protocol that provably shows these bounds.

Our second contribution is analyzing gossip-based aggregate computation in sparse networks. In sparse topologies such as P2P networks, point-to-point communication between all pairs of nodes (as assumed in gossip-based protocols) may not be a reasonable assumption. On the other hand, a small number of neighbors in such networks makes it feasible to send one message simultaneously to all neighbors in one round: in fact, this is a standard assumption in the distributed message passing model [19]. We show how our DRR technique leads to improved gossip-based aggregate computation in such (arbitrary) sparse networks, e.g., P2P network topologies such as Chord [25]. The improvement relies on a key property of the DRR scheme that we prove: *height* of each tree produced by DRR in any *arbitrary* graph is bounded by $O(\log n)$ whp. In Chord, for example, we show that DRR-gossip takes $O(\log^2 n)$ time whp and $O(n \log n)$ messages. In contrast, uniform gossip gives $O(\log^2 n)$ rounds and $O(n \log^2 n)$ messages.

Our algorithm is non-address oblivious, i.e., some steps use addresses to decide which partner to communicate in a round. The time complexity of our algorithm is optimal and the message complexity is within a factor $o(\log \log n)$ of the optimal. This is because, Karp et al [7] showed a lower bound of $\omega(n)$ for any non-address oblivious rumor spreading algorithm that operates in $O(\log n)$ rounds. (Computing aggregates

is at least as hard as rumor spreading.)

Our third contribution is a non-trivial lower bound of $\Omega(n \log n)$ on the message complexity of any address-oblivious algorithm for computing aggregates. This lower bound holds regardless of the number of rounds taken or the size of the messages (i.e., even assuming that nodes that can send arbitrarily long messages). Our result shows that non-address oblivious algorithms (such as ours) are needed to obtain a significant improvement in message complexity. We note that this bound is significantly larger than the $\Omega(n \log \log n)$ messages shown by Karp et al. for rumor spreading. Thus our result also gives the first formal proof that computing aggregates is strictly harder than rumor spreading in the address-oblivious model. Another implication of our result is that the algorithm of Kempe et al. [9] is asymptotically message optimal for the address-oblivious model.

Our algorithm, henceforth called *DRR-gossip*, proceeds in phases. In phase one, every node runs the DRR scheme to construct a forest of (disjoint) trees. In phase two, each tree computes its local aggregate (e.g., sum or maximum) by a convergecast process; the local aggregate is obtained at the root. Finally in phase three, all the roots utilize a suitably modified version of the uniform gossip algorithm of Kempe et al. [9] to obtain the global aggregate. Finally, if necessary, the roots forward the global aggregate to other nodes in their trees.

1.3 Organization

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. The network model is described in Section 2 followed by sections where each phase of the DRR-gossip algorithm is introduced and analyzed separately. The whole DRR-gossip algorithm is summarized in Section 3.4. Section 4 applies DRR-gossip to sparse networks. An lower bound on the message complexity of any address-oblivious algorithm for computing aggregates is presented and proved in Section 5. Section 1.4 lists the main probabilistic tools used in our analysis — the Doob martingale and Azuma’s inequality. Section 6 concludes with some open questions.

1.4 Probabilistic Preliminaries

We use Doob martingales extensively in our analysis [14]. Let $X_0, \dots, X_n$ be *any* sequence of random variables and let Y be any random variable with $E[|Y|] < \infty$. Define the random variable $Z_i = E[Y|X_0, \dots, X_i]$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$. Then $Z_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_n$ form a **Doob martingale** sequence.

We use the martingale inequality known as Azuma’s inequality, stated as follows [14]. Let $X_0, X_1, \dots$ be a martingale sequence such that for each k ,

$$|X_k - X_{k-1}| \leq c_k$$

where c_k may depend on k . Then for all $t \geq 0$ and any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\Pr(|X_t - X_0| \geq \lambda) \leq 2e^{-\frac{\lambda^2}{2 \sum_{k=1}^t c_k^2}} \quad (1)$$

We also need the following variant of the Chernoff bound from [18], that works in the case of dependent indicator random variables that are correlated as defined below.

Lemma 1 ([18]) *Let $Z_1, Z_2, \dots, Z_s \in \{0, 1\}$ be random variables such that for all l , and for any $S_{l-1} \subseteq \{1, \dots, l-1\}$, $\Pr(Z_l = 1 | \bigwedge_{j \in S_{l-1}} Z_j = 1) \leq \Pr(Z_l = 1)$. Then for any $\delta > 0$, $\Pr(\sum_{l=1}^s Z_l \geq \mu(1 + \delta)) \leq (\frac{e^\delta}{(1+\delta)^{1+\delta}})^\mu$, where $\mu = \sum_{l=1}^s E[Z_l]$.*

Algorithm 1: $\mathbb{F} = \text{DRR}(G)$

```
foreach node  $i \in V$  do
  choose  $\text{rank}(i)$  independently and uniformly at random from  $[0, 1]$  ;
  set  $\text{found} = \text{FALSE}$  // higher ranked node not yet found ;
  set  $\text{parent}(i) = \text{NULL}$  // initially every node is a root node;
  set  $k = 0$  // number of random nodes probed ;
  repeat
    sample a node  $u$  independently and uniformly at random from  $V$  and get its rank ;
    if  $\text{rank}(u) > \text{rank}(i)$  then
      set  $\text{parent}(i) = u$ ;
      set  $\text{found} = \text{TRUE}$ ;
      set  $k = k + 1$ ;
    end
  until  $\text{found} == \text{TRUE}$  or  $k < \log n - 1$ ;
  if  $\text{found} == \text{TRUE}$  then
    send a connection message including its identifier,  $i$ , to its parent node  $\text{parent}(i)$ ;
  end
  Collect the connection messages and accordingly construct the set of its children nodes,  $\text{Child}(i)$ ;
  if  $\text{Child}(i) = \emptyset$  then
    become a leaf node;
  else
    become an intermediate node;
  end
end
```

2 Model

The network consists of a set V of n nodes; each node $i \in V$ has a data value denoted by v_i . The goal is to compute aggregate functions such as Min, Max, Sum, Average etc., of the node values.

The nodes communicate in discrete time-steps referred to as *rounds*. As in prior works on this problem [7, 8], we assume that communication rounds are synchronized, and all nodes can communicate simultaneously in a given round. Each node can communicate with every other node. In a round, each node can choose a communication partner independently and uniformly at random. A node i is said to *call* a node j if i chooses j as a communication partner. (This is known as the *random phone call* model [7].) Once a call is established, we assume that information can be exchanged in both directions along the link. In one round, a node can call only *one* other node. We assume that nodes have unique addresses. The length of a message is limited to $O(\log n + \log s)$, where s is the range of values. It is important to limit the size of messages used in aggregate computation, as communication bandwidth is often a costly resource in distributed settings. All the above assumptions are also used in prior works [8, 9]. Similar to the algorithms of [8, 9], our algorithm can tolerate the following two types of failures: (i) some fraction of nodes may crash initially, and (ii) links are lossy and messages can get lost. Thus, while nodes cannot fail once the algorithm has started, communication can fail with a certain probability δ . Without loss of generality, $1/\log n < \delta < 1/8$: Larger values of δ , requires only $O(1/\log(1/\delta))$ repeated calls to bring down the probability below $1/8$, and smaller values only make it easier to prove our claims.

Throughout the paper, “with high probability (whp)” means “with probability at least $1 - 1/n^\alpha$, for some $\alpha > 0$ ”.

3 DRR-Gossip Algorithms

3.1 Phase I: Distributed Random Ranking (DRR)

The DRR algorithm is as follows (cf. Algorithm 1). Every node $i \in V$ chooses a rank independently and uniformly at random from $[0, 1]$. (Equivalently, each node can choose a rank uniformly at random from $[1, n^3]$ which leads to the same asymptotic bounds; however, choosing from $[0, 1]$ leads to a smoother analysis, e.g., allows use of integrals.) Each node i then samples up to $\log n - 1$ random nodes sequentially (one in each round) till it finds a node of higher rank to connect to. If none of the $\log n - 1$ sampled nodes have a higher rank then node i becomes a “root”. Since every node except root nodes connects to a node with higher rank, there is no cycle in the graph. Thus this process results in a collection of disjoint trees which together constitute a forest $\mathbb{F}$.

In the following two theorems, we show the upper bounds of the number of trees and the size of each tree produced by the DRR algorithm; these are critical in bounding the time complexity of DRR-gossip.

Theorem 2 (Number of Trees) *The number of trees produced by the DRR algorithm is $O(n/\log n)$ whp.*

Proof: Assume that ranks have already been assigned to the nodes. All ranks are distinct with probability 1. Number the nodes according to the order statistic of their ranks: the i th node is the node with the i th smallest rank. Let the indicator random variable X_i take the value of 1 if the i th smallest node is a root and 0 otherwise. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ be the total number of roots. The i th smallest node becomes a root if all the nodes that it samples have rank smaller than or equal to itself, i.e., $\Pr(X_i = 1) = \left(\frac{i}{n}\right)^{\log n - 1}$. Hence, by linearity of expectation, the expected number of roots (and thus, trees) is:

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr(X_i = 1) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{i}{n}\right)^{\log n - 1} = \Theta\left(\int_1^n \left(\frac{i}{n}\right)^{\log n - 1} di\right) = \Theta\left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right).$$

Note that X_i s are independent (but not identically distributed) random variables, since the probability that the i th smallest ranked node becomes the root depends only on the $\log n - 1$ random nodes that it samples and independent of the samples of the rest of the nodes. Thus, applying a Chernoff’s bound [14], we have:

$$\Pr(X > 6E[X]) \leq 2^{E[X]} = o(1/n). \quad \blacksquare$$

Theorem 3 (Size of a tree) *The number of nodes in every tree produced by the DRR algorithm is at most $O(\log n)$ whp.*

Proof: We bound that the probability that a tree of size $\Omega(\log n)$ is produced by the DRR algorithm. Fix a set S of $k = c \log n$ nodes, for some sufficiently large positive constant c . We first compute the probability that this set of k nodes form a tree. For the sake of analysis, we will direct tree edges as follows: a tree edge (i, j) is directed from node i to node j if $\text{rank}(i) < \text{rank}(j)$, i.e. i connects to j . Without loss of generality, fix a permutation of S : $(s_1, \dots, s_\alpha, \dots, s_\beta, \dots, s_k)$ where $\text{rank}(s_\alpha) > \text{rank}(s_\beta)$, $1 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq k$. This permutation induces a directed spanning tree on S in the following sense: s_1 is the root and any other node s_α ($1 < \alpha \leq k$) connects to a node in the totally (strictly) ordered set $\{s_1, \dots, s_{\alpha-1}\}$ (as fixed by the above permutation). For convenience, we denote the event that a node s connects to any node on a directed tree, T , as $s \rightarrow T$. Note that $s \rightarrow T$ implies that s ’s rank is less than that of any node on the tree T . Also, we denote the event of a directed spanning tree being induced on the totally (strictly) ordered set $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_\alpha, \dots, s_h\}$ as T_h , where a node s_α can only connect to its preceding nodes in the ordered set. As a special case, T_1 is the event of the induced directed tree containing only the root node s_1 . We are interested in the event T_k , i.e., the set S of k nodes forming a directed spanning tree in the above fashion. In the following, we bound the probability of the event T_k happening:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(T_k) &= \Pr(T_1 \cap (s_2 \rightarrow T_1) \cap (s_3 \rightarrow T_2) \cap \dots \cap (s_k \rightarrow T_{k-1})) \\ &= \Pr(T_1) \Pr(s_2 \rightarrow T_1 | T_1) \Pr(s_3 \rightarrow T_2 | T_2) \dots \Pr(s_k \rightarrow T_{k-1} | T_{k-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

To bound each of the terms in the product, we use the principle of deferred decisions: when a new node is sampled (i.e., for the first time) we assign it a random rank. For simplicity, we assume that each node sampled is a new node — this does not change the asymptotic bound, since there are now only $k = O(\log n)$ nodes under consideration and each node samples at most $O(\log n)$ nodes. This assumption allows us to use the principle of deferred decisions to assign random ranks without worrying about sampling an already sampled node. Below we bound the conditional probability $\Pr(s_\alpha \rightarrow T_{\alpha-1} | T_{\alpha-1})$, for any $2 \leq \alpha \leq k$ as follows. Let $r_q = \text{rank}(s_q)$ be the rank of node s_q , $1 \leq q \leq \alpha$; then

$$\Pr(s_\alpha \rightarrow T_{\alpha-1} | T_{\alpha-1}) \leq \int_0^1 \int_0^{r_1} \int_0^{r_2} \cdots \int_0^{r_{\alpha-1}} \sum_{h=0}^{\log n - 1} \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{n} \right) r_\alpha^h dr_\alpha \cdots dr_1.$$

The explanation for the above bound is as follows: Since $T_{\alpha-1}$ is a directed spanning tree on the first $\alpha - 1$ nodes, and s_α connects to $T_{\alpha-1}$, we have $r_1 > r_2 > \cdots > r_{\alpha-1} > r_\alpha$. Hence r_1 can take any value between 0 and 1, r_2 can take any value between 0 and r_1 and so on. This is captured by the respective ranges of the integrals. The term inside the integrals is explained as follows. There are at most $\log n - 1$ attempts for node s_α to connect to any one of the first $\alpha - 1$ nodes. Suppose, it connects in the h th attempt. Then, the first $h - 1$ attempts should connect to nodes whose rank should be less than r_α , hence the term r_α^h (as mentioned earlier, we assume that we don't sample an already sampled node, this doesn't change the bound asymptotically). The term $(\alpha - 1)/n$ is the probability that s_α connects to any one of the first $\alpha - 1$ nodes in the h th attempt.

Simplifying the right hand side, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr(s_\alpha \rightarrow T_{\alpha-1} | T_{\alpha-1}) \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha - 1}{n} \int_0^1 \int_0^{r_1} \int_0^{r_2} \cdots \int_0^{r_{\alpha-1}} [1 + r_\alpha + r_\alpha^2 + \cdots + r_\alpha^{\log n - 1}] dr_\alpha \cdots dr_1 \\ & = \frac{\alpha - 1}{n} \left(\frac{0!}{\alpha!} + \frac{1!}{(\alpha + 1)!} + \frac{2!}{(\alpha + 2)!} + \cdots + \frac{(\log n)!}{(\log n + \alpha)!} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The above expression is bounded by $\frac{b}{n}$, where $0 < b < 1$ if $\alpha > 2$ and $0 < b \leq (1 - \frac{1}{\log n + 2})$ if $\alpha = 2$. Besides, $\Pr(T_1) \leq \frac{1}{\log n}$ (cf. Theorem 2); hence, the equation (2) is bounded by $(\frac{b}{n})^{k-1} \frac{1}{\log n}$.

Using the above, the probability that a tree of size $k = c \log n$ is produced by the DRR algorithm is bounded by

$$\binom{n}{k} k! \left(\frac{b}{n} \right)^{k-1} \frac{1}{\log n} \leq \frac{(ne)^k}{k^k} O(\sqrt{k}) \frac{k^k}{e^k} \left(\frac{b}{n} \right)^{k-1} \frac{1}{\log n} \leq \frac{c' \cdot n}{\log^{\frac{1}{2}} n} \cdot b^{k-1} = o(1/n),$$

if c sufficiently large. ■

Complexity of Phase I — the DRR algorithm

Theorem 4 *The message complexity of the DRR algorithm is $O(n \log \log n)$ whp. The time complexity is $O(\log n)$ rounds.*

Proof: Let $d = \log n - 1$. Fix a node i . Its rank is chosen uniformly at random from $[0, 1]$. The expected number of nodes sampled before a node i finds a higher ranked node (or else, all d nodes will be sampled) is computed as follows. The probability that exactly k nodes will be sampled is $\Theta(\frac{1}{k+1} \frac{1}{k})$, since the last node sampled should be the highest ranked node and i should be the second highest ranked node (whp, all the nodes sampled will be unique). Hence the expected number of nodes probed is $\sum_{k=1}^d \Theta\left(k \frac{1}{k+1} \frac{1}{k}\right) = O(\log d)$. Hence the number of messages exchanged by node i is $O(\log d)$. By linearity of expectation, the total number of messages exchanged by all nodes is $O(n \log d) = O(n \log \log n)$.

To show concentration, we set up a Doob martingale as follows. Let X denote the random variable that counts the total number of nodes sampled by all nodes. $E[X] = O(n \log d)$. Assume that ranks have already

Algorithm 2: $\text{cov}_{max} = \text{convergecast-max}(\mathbb{F}, \mathbf{v})$

Input: the ranking forest $\mathbb{F}$, and the value vector $\mathbf{v}$ over all nodes in $\mathbb{F}$

Output: the local *Max* aggregate vector cov_{max} over roots

foreach *leaf node* **do** send its value to its parent;

foreach *intermediate node* **do**

- collect values from its children;
- compare collected values with its own value;
- update its value to the maximum amid all and send the maximum to its parent.

end

foreach *root node* z **do**

- collect values from its children;
- compare collected values with its own value;
- update its value to the local maximum value $\text{cov}_{max}(z)$.

end

been assigned to the nodes. Number the nodes according to the order statistic of their ranks: the i th node is the node with the i th smallest rank. Let the indicator r.v. Z_{ik} ($1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq k \leq d$) indicate whether the k th sample by the i th *smallest ranked* node succeeded or not (i.e., it found a higher ranked node). If it succeeded then $Z_{ij} = 1$ for all $j \leq k$ and $Z_{ij} = 0$ for all $j > k$. Thus $X = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d Z_{ik}$. Then the sequence $X_0 = E[X]$, $X_1 = E[X|Z_{11}]$, $\dots$, $X_{nd} = E[X|Z_{11}, \dots, Z_{nd}]$ is a Doob martingale. Note that $|X_\ell - X_{\ell-1}| \leq d$ ($1 \leq \ell \leq nd$) because fixing the outcome of a sample of one node affects only the outcomes of other samples made by the same node and not the samples made by other nodes. Applying Azuma's inequality, for a positive constant ϵ we have:

$$\Pr(|X - E[X]| \geq \epsilon n) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{\epsilon^2 n^2}{2n(\log n)^3} \right) = o(1/n).$$

The time complexity is immediate since each node probes at most $O(\log n)$ nodes in as many rounds. ■

3.2 Phase II: Convergecast and Broadcast

In the second phase of our algorithm, the local aggregate of each tree is obtained at the root by the Convergecast algorithm — an aggregation process starting from leaf nodes and proceeding upward along the tree to the root node. For example, to compute the local max/min, all leave nodes simply send their values to their parent nodes. An intermediate node collects the values from its children, compares them with its own value and sends its parent node the max/min value among all received values and its own. A root node then can obtain the local max/min value of its tree. Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 are the pseudo-codes of the Convergecast-max algorithm and the Convergecast-sum algorithm, respectively.

After the Convergecast process, each root broadcasts its address to all other nodes in its tree via the tree links. This process proceeds from the root down to the leaves via the tree links (these two-way links were already established during Phase 1.) At the end of this process, all non-root nodes know the identity (address) of their respective roots.

Complexity of Phase II

Every node except the root nodes needs to send a message to its parent in the upward aggregation process of the Convergecast algorithms. So the message complexity is $O(n)$. Since each node can communicate with at most one node in one round, the time complexity is bounded by the size of the tree. (This is the reason for bounding size and not just the height.) Since the tree size (hence, tree height also) is bounded by $O(\log n)$ (cf. Theorem 3) the time complexity of Convergecast and Broadcast is $O(\log n)$. Moreover, as the number of roots is at most $O(n/\log n)$ by Theorem 2, the message complexity for broadcast is also $O(n)$.

Algorithm 3: $\text{cov}_{sum} = \text{convergecast-sum}(\mathbb{F}, \mathbf{v})$

Input: the ranking forest $\mathbb{F}$ and the value vector $\mathbf{v}$ over all nodes in $\mathbb{F}$

Output: the local *Ave* aggregate vector cov_{max} over roots.

Initialization: every node i stores a row vector $(v_i, w_i = 1)$ including its value v_i and a size count w_i ;

foreach leaf node $i \in \mathbb{F}$ **do**

- send its parent a message containing the vector $(v_i, w_i = 1)$;
- reset $(v_i, w_i) = (0, 0)$.

end

foreach intermediate node $j \in \mathbb{F}$ **do**

- collect messages (vectors) from its children;
- compute and update $v_j = v_j + \sum_{k \in \text{Child}(j)} v_k$, and $w_j = w_j + \sum_{k \in \text{Child}(j)} w_k$, where $\text{Child}(j) = \{j\text{'s children nodes}\}$;
- send computed (v_j, w_j) to its parent;
- reset its vector $(v_j, w_j) = (0, 0)$ when its parent successfully receives its message.

end

foreach root node $z \in \tilde{V}$ **do**

- collect messages (vectors) from its children;
- compute the local sum aggregate $\text{cov}_{sum}(z, 1) = v_z + \sum_{k \in \text{Child}(z)} v_k$, and the size count of the tree $\text{cov}_{sum}(z, 2) = w_z + \sum_{k \in \text{Child}(z)} w_k$, where $\text{Child}(z) = \{z\text{'s children nodes}\}$.

end

3.3 Phase III: Gossip

In the third phase, all roots of the trees compute the global aggregate by performing the uniform gossip algorithm on the graph $\tilde{G} = \text{clique}(\tilde{V})$, where $\tilde{V} \subseteq V$ is the set of roots and $|\tilde{V}| = m = O(n/\log n)$.

The idea of uniform gossip is as follows. Every root independently and uniformly at random selects a node to send its message. If the selected node is another root then the task is completed. If not, the selected node needs to forward the received message to its root (all nodes in a tree know the root's address at the end of Phase II — here is where we use a non-address oblivious communication). Thus, to traverse through an edge of $\tilde{G}$, a message needs at most two hops of G .

Algorithm 4, Gossip-max, and Algorithm 6, Gossip-ave (which is a modification from the Push-Sum algorithm of [8, 9]) compute the *Max* and *Ave* aggregates respectively (other aggregates such as Min, Sum etc., can be calculated by a suitable modification). Note that, unlike Gossip-max, Gossip-ave algorithm does not need a sampling procedure.

Algorithm 5, Data-spread, a modification of Gossip-max, can be used by a root node to spread its value. If a root needs to spread a particular value over the network, it sets this value as its initial value and all other roots set their initial value to minus infinity.

3.3.1 Performance of Gossip-max and Data-spread Algorithms

Let m denote the number of root nodes. By Theorem 2, we have $m = |\tilde{V}| = O(n/\log n)$ where $n = |V|$. Karp, et al. [7] show that all m nodes of a complete graph can know a particular rumor (e.g., the *Max* in our application) in $O(\log m) = O(\log n)$ rounds with high probability by using their Push algorithm (a prototype of our Gossip-max algorithm) with uniform selection probability. Similar to the Push algorithm, Gossip-max needs $O(m \log m) = O(n)$ messages for all roots to obtain *Max* if the selection probability is uniform, i.e., $1/m$. However, in the implementation of the Gossip-max algorithm on the forest, the root of a tree is selected with a *probability proportional to its size (number of nodes in the tree)*. Hence, the selection probability is not uniform. In this case, we can only guarantee that after the gossip procedure of the Gossip-max algorithm, a portion of the roots including the root of the largest tree will possess the *Max*. After the gossip procedure,

Algorithm 4: $\hat{x}_{max} = \text{Gossip-max}(G, \mathbb{F}, \tilde{V}, \mathbf{y})$

Initialization: every root $i \in \tilde{V}$ is of the initial value $x_{0,i} = y(i)$ from the input $\mathbf{y}$.
/* To compute Max , $x_{0,i} = y(i) = \text{cov}_{max}(i)$; To compute Ave , $x_{0,i} = y(i) = \text{cov}_{sum}(i, 2) \cdot * /$;
Gossip procedure::
for $t=1 : O(\log n)$ rounds **do**
 Every root $i \in \tilde{V}$ independently and uniformly at random, selects a node in V and sends the selected node a message containing its current value $x_{t-1,i}$;
 Every node $j \in V - \tilde{V}$ forwards any received messages to its root.;
 Every root $i \in \tilde{V}$;
 — collects messages and compares the received values with its own value;
 — updates its current value $x_{t,i}$, which is also the $\hat{x}_{max,t}(i)$, node i 's current estimate of Max , to the maximum among all received values and its own.;
end
Sampling procedure::
for $t=1 : \frac{1}{c} \log n$ rounds **do**
 Every root $i \in \tilde{V}$ independently and uniformly at random selects a node in V and sends each of the selected nodes an inquiry message.;
 Every node $j \in V - \tilde{V}$ forwards any received inquiry messages to its root.;
 Every root $i \in \tilde{V}$, upon receiving inquiry messages, sends the inquiring roots its value.;
 Every root $i \in \tilde{V}$, updates $x_{t,i}$, i.e. $\hat{x}_{max,t}(i)$, to the maximum value it inquires.
end

Algorithm 5: $\hat{x}_{ru} = \text{Data-spread}(G, \mathbb{F}, \tilde{V}, x_{ru})$

Initialization: A root node $i \in \tilde{V}$ which intends to spread its value x_{ru} , $|x_{ru}| < \infty$ sets $x_{0,i} = x_{ru}$.
All the other nodes j set $x_{0,j} = -\infty$;
Run gossip-max($G, \mathbb{F}, \tilde{V}, \mathbf{x}_0$) on the initialized values.

Algorithm 6: $\hat{x}_{ave} = \text{Gossip-ave}(G, \mathbb{F}, \tilde{V}, \text{cov}_{sum})$

Initialization: Every root $i \in \tilde{V}$ sets a vector $(s_{0,i}, g_{0,i}) = \text{cov}_{sum}(i)$, where $s_{0,i}$ and $g_{0,i}$ are the local sum of values and the size of the tree rooted at i , respectively.;
for $t = 1 : O(\log m + \log(1/\epsilon))$ rounds **do**
 Every root node $i \in \tilde{V}$ independently and uniformly at random selects a node in V and sends the selected node a message containing a row vector $(s_{t-1,i}/2, g_{t-1,i}/2)$.;
 Every node $j \in V - \tilde{V}$ forwards any received messages to the root of its ranking tree.;
 Let $A_{t,i} \subseteq \tilde{V}$ be the set of roots whose messages reach root node i at round t . Every root node $i \in \tilde{V}$ updates its row vector by;
 $s_{t,i} = s_{t-1,i}/2 + \sum_{j \in A_{t,i}} s_{t-1,j}/2$;;
 $g_{t,i} = g_{t-1,i}/2 + \sum_{j \in A_{t,i}} g_{t-1,j}/2$;;
 Every root node $i \in \tilde{V}$ updates its estimate of the global average by $\hat{x}_{ave,t}(i) = \hat{x}_{ave,t,i} = s_{t,i}/g_{t,i}$.
end

roots can sample $O(\log n)$ number of other roots to confirm and update, if necessary, their values and reach consensus on the global maximum, Max .

We show the following theorem for Gossip-Max

Theorem 5 *After the gossip procedure of the Gossip-max algorithm, at least $\Omega(\frac{cn}{\log n})$ root nodes obtain the global maximum, Max , whp, where $n = |V|$ and $0 < c < 1$ is a constant.*

Proof: As per our failure model, a message may fail to reach the selected root node with probability ρ (which is at most 2δ , since failure may occur either during the initial call to a non-root node or during the forwarding call from the non-root node to the root of its tree). For convenience, we call those roots who know the Max value (the global Maximum) as the max-roots and those who do not as the non-max-roots.

Let R_t be the number of max-roots in round t . Our proof is in two steps. We first show that, whp, $R_t > 4 \log n$ after $8 \log n / (1 - \rho)$ rounds of Gossip-max. If $R_0 > 4 \log n$ then the task is completed. Consider the case when $R_0 < 4 \log n$. Since the initial number of max-roots is small in this case, the chance that a max-root selects another max-root is small. Similarly, the chance that two or more max-roots select the same root is also small. So, in this step, whp a max-root will select a non-max-root to send out its gossip message. If the gossip message successfully reaches the selected non-max-root, the R_t will increase by 1. Let X_i denote the indicator of the event that a gossip message i from some max-root successfully reaches the selected non-max-root. We have $Pr(X_i = 1) = (1 - \rho)$. Then $X = \sum_{i=1}^{8 \log n / (1 - \rho)} X_i$ is the minimal number of max-roots after $8 \log n / (1 - \rho)$ rounds. Clearly, $E[X] = 8 \log n$. Here we conservatively assume the worst situation that initially there is only one max-root and at each round only one max-root selects a non-max-root. So X is the minimal number of max-roots after $8 \log n / (1 - \rho)$ rounds.

Applying Azuma's inequality [14] and setting $\epsilon = 1/2$:

$$\begin{aligned} Pr(|X - E[X]| > \epsilon E[X]) &< 2 \exp \left(-\frac{\epsilon^2 E[X]^2}{2 \left(\frac{8 \log n}{1 - \rho} \right)} \right) \\ &< 2 \exp \left(-\frac{\frac{1}{4} E[X]^2}{16 \log n} \right) = 2 \exp(-\log n) = 2 \cdot n^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, with probability at least $1 - \frac{2}{n}$, after $8 \log n / (1 - \rho) = O(\log n)$ rounds, $R_t > \frac{1}{2} E[X] = 4 \log n$.

In the second step of our proof, we find the *lower bound of the increasing rate* of R_t when $R_t > 4 \log n$. In each round, there are R_t messages sent out from max-roots. Let Y_i denote the indicator of an event that such a message i from a max-root successfully reaches a non-max-root. The $Y_i = 0$ when one of the following event happens. (1) The message i fails in routing to its destination in probability ρ . (2) The message i destined to another max-root although it successfully travels over the network with probability $(1 - \rho)$. The probability of this event is at most $\frac{(1 - \rho) R_t \log n}{n}$ since whp the size of a ranking tree is $O(\log n)$ (cf. Theorem 3). (3) The message i and at least one another message are destined to the same non-max-root. As the probability three or more messages are destined to a same node is very small, we only consider the case that two messages select the same non-max-root. We also conservatively exclude both two messages on their possible contributions to the increase of R_t . This event happens with the probability at most $\frac{(1 - \rho) R_t \log n}{n}$.

Applying union bound [14],

$$Pr(Y_i = 0) \leq \rho + \frac{2(1 - \rho) R_t \log n}{n}.$$

Since $R_t \leq \frac{cn}{\log n}$ for any constant $0 < c < 1$ (otherwise, the task is completed),

$$Pr(Y_i = 0) \leq \rho + 2c(1 - \rho) = c' + (1 - c')\rho,$$

where $c' = 2c < 1$ is a constant that is suitably fixed so that $c' + (1 - c')\rho < 1$. Consequently, we have $Pr(Y_i = 1) > (1 - c')(1 - \rho)$, and $E[Y] = \sum_{i=1}^{R_t} E[Y_i] > (1 - c')(1 - \rho) R_t$. Applying Azuma's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} Pr(|Y - E[Y]| > \epsilon E[Y]) &< 2 \exp \left(-\frac{\epsilon^2 E[Y]^2}{2 R_t} \right) \\ &< 2 \exp \left(-\frac{\epsilon^2 (1 - c')^2 (1 - \rho)^2 R_t}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since in this step, whp $R_t > 4 \log n$, and $(1 - c')^2(1 - \rho)^2 > 0$, setting $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\alpha = O(1)$, we obtain

$$Pr(Y < \frac{1}{2}(1 - c')(1 - \rho)R_t) < 2 \cdot n^{-\alpha}.$$

Thus, whp, $R_{t+1} > R_t + \frac{1}{2}(1 - c')(1 - \rho)R_t = \beta R_t$, where $\beta = 1 + \frac{1}{2}(1 - c')(1 - \rho) > 1$. Therefore, whp, after $(8 \log n / (1 - \rho) + \log_\beta n) = O(\log n)$ rounds, at least $\Omega(\frac{cn}{\log n})$ roots will have the *Max*. ■

Sampling Procedure

From Theorem 5, after the gossip procedure, there are $\Omega(\frac{cn}{\log n}) = \Omega(cm)$, $0 < c < 1$ nodes with the *Max* value. For roots to reach consensus on *Max*, they sample each other as in the sampling procedure. It is possible that the root of a larger tree will be sampled more frequently than the roots of smaller trees. However, this non-uniformity is an advantage, since the roots of larger trees would have obtained *Max* (in the gossip procedure) with higher probability due to this same non-uniformity. Hence, in the sampling procedure, a root without *Max* can obtain *Max* with higher probability by this non-uniform sampling. Thus, we have the following theorem

Theorem 6 *After the sampling procedure of Gossip-max algorithm, all roots know the Max value, whp.*

Proof: After the sampling procedure, the probability that none of the roots possessing the *Max* is sampled by a root not knowing the *Max* is at most $(\frac{m-cm}{m})^{\frac{1}{c} \log n} < \frac{1}{n}$. Thus, after the sampling procedure, with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{n}$, all the roots will know the *Max*. ■

Complexity of Gossip-max and Data-spread algorithms

The gossip procedure takes $O(\log n)$ rounds and $O(m \log n) = O(\frac{n}{\log n} \log n) = O(n)$ messages. The sampling procedure takes $O(\frac{1}{c} \log n) = O(\log n)$ rounds and $O(\frac{m}{c} \log n) = O(n)$ messages. To sum up, this phase totally takes $O(\log n)$ rounds and $O(n)$ messages for all the roots in the network to reach consensus on *Max*. The complexity of Data-spread algorithm is the same as Gossip-max algorithm.

3.3.2 Performance of Gossip-ave Algorithm

When the uniformity assumption holds in gossip (i.e., in each round, nodes are selected uniformly at random), it has been shown in [9] that on an m -clique with probability at least $1 - \delta'$, Gossip-ave (uniform push-sum in [9]) needs $O(\log m + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\delta'})$ rounds and $O(m(\log m + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\delta'}))$ messages for all m nodes to reach consensus on the global average within a relative error of at most ϵ . When uniformity does not hold, the performance of uniform gossip will depend on the distribution of selection probability. In efficient gossip algorithm [8], it is shown that the node being selected with the largest probability will have the global average, *Ave*, in $O(\log m + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ rounds. Here, we prove that the same upper bound holds for our Gossip-ave algorithm, namely, the root of the largest tree will have *Ave* after $O(\log m + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ rounds of the gossip procedure of Gossip-ave algorithm. In this bound, $m = O(n / \log n)$ is the number of roots (obtained from the DRR algorithm) and the relative error $\epsilon = n^{-\alpha}$, $\alpha > 0$.

Theorem 7 *Whp, there exists a time $T_{ave} = O(\log m + \alpha \log n) = O(\log n)$, $\alpha > 0$, such that for all time $t \geq T_{ave}$, the relative error of the estimate of average aggregate on the root of the largest ranking tree, z , is at most $\frac{2}{n^{\alpha-1}}$, where the relative error is $\frac{|\hat{x}_{ave,t,z} - x_{ave}|}{|x_{ave}|}$, and the average aggregate, *Ave*, is $x_{ave} = \frac{\sum_i v_i}{n}$.*

We recall that the gossip-ave algorithm works on the graph $\tilde{G} = \text{clique}(\tilde{V})$, where $\tilde{V} \subseteq V$ is the set of roots and $|\tilde{V}| = m = O(n / \log n)$. To prove Theorem 7, we need some definitions as in [9]. We define a m -tuple contribution vector $\mathbf{y}_{t,i}$ such that $s_{t,i} = \mathbf{y}_{t,i} \cdot \mathbf{x} = \sum_j y_{t,i,j} x_j$ and $w_{t,i} = \|\mathbf{y}_{t,i}\|_1 = \sum_j y_{t,i,j}$, where $y_{t,i,j}$ is the j -th entry of $\mathbf{y}_{t,i}$ and x_j is the initial value at root node j , i.e., $x_j = \text{cov}_{sum}(j)$, the local aggregate of the tree rooted at node j computed by Convergecast-sum. $\mathbf{y}_{0,i} = \mathbf{e}_i$, the unit vector with the i -th entry being 1. Therefore, $\sum_i y_{t,i,j} = 1$, and $\sum_i w_{t,i} = m$. When $\mathbf{y}_{t,i}$ is close to $\frac{1}{m} \mathbf{1}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the vector with all entries 1, the approximate of *Ave*, $\hat{x}_{ave,t,i} = \frac{s_{t,i}}{w_{t,i}}$, is close to the true average x_{ave} . Note that $w_{t,i}$, which is different from $g_{t,i}$, is a dummy parameter borrowed from [9] to characterize the diffusion speed.

In our Gossip-ave algorithm, we set $g_{0,i}$ to be the size of the root i 's tree. The algorithm then computes the estimate of average directly by $\hat{x}_{ave,t,i} = s_{t,i}/g_{t,i}$. If we set a dummy weight $w_{t,i}$, whose initial value $w_{0,i} = 1, \forall i \in \tilde{V}$, the algorithm performs in the same manner: every node works on a triplet $(s_{t,i}, g_{t,i}, w_{t,i})$ and computes $\hat{x}_{ave,t,i} = \frac{(s_{t,i}/w_{t,i})}{(g_{t,i}/w_{t,i})}$. $(s_{t,i}/w_{t,i})$ is the estimate of the average local sum on a root and $g_{t,i}/w_{t,i}$ is the estimate of the average size of a tree. Their relative errors are bounded in the same way as follows.

The relative error in the contributions (with respect to the diffusion effect of gossip) at node i at time t is $\Delta_{t,i} = \max_j | \frac{y_{t,i,j}}{\|\mathbf{y}_{t,i}\|_1} - \frac{1}{m} | = \| \frac{\mathbf{y}_{t,i}}{\|\mathbf{y}_{t,i}\|_1} - \frac{1}{m} \cdot \mathbf{1} \|_\infty$. The following potential function

$$\Phi_t = \sum_{i,j} (y_{t,i,j} - \frac{w_{t,i}}{m})^2$$

is the sum of the variance of the contributions $y_{t,i,j}$. We name the root of the largest tree as node z .

To prove Theorem 7, we need some auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 8 (Geometric convergence of Φ) *The conditional expectation*

$$E[\Phi_{t+1} | \Phi_t = \phi] = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sum_{i \in \tilde{V}} P_i^2)\phi < \frac{1}{2}\phi$$

where $P_i = (1 - \delta)\frac{g_i}{n}$ is the probability that the root node i is selected by any other root node, g_i is the size of the tree rooted at node i , δ is the probability that a message fails to reach its destined root node, and n is the total number of nodes in the network.

Proof: This proof is generalized from [9]. The difference is that the selection probability, P_i , is not uniform any more but depends on the tree size, g_i . P_i is the probability that root i is selected by any other root and $\sum_{i \in \tilde{V}} P_i^2$ is the probability that two roots select the same root. The conditional expectation of potential at round $t + 1$ is

$$\begin{aligned} E[\Phi_{t+1} | \Phi_t = \phi] &= \frac{1}{2}\phi + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,k} \left(y_{i,j} - \frac{w_i}{m}\right) \left(y_{k,j} - \frac{w_k}{m}\right) P_i \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k} \sum_{k' \neq k} \left(y_{k,j} - \frac{w_k}{m}\right) \left(y_{k',j} - \frac{w_{k'}}{m}\right) \sum_{i \in \tilde{V}} P_i^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\phi + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j,k} \left(y_{i,j} - \frac{w_i}{m}\right) \left(y_{k,j} - \frac{w_k}{m}\right) P_i \\ &\quad + \frac{\sum_{i \in \tilde{V}} P_i^2}{2} \sum_{k,j,k'} \left(y_{k,j} - \frac{w_k}{m}\right) \left(y_{k',j} - \frac{w_{k'}}{m}\right) \\ &\quad - \frac{\sum_{i \in \tilde{V}} P_i^2}{2} \sum_{k,j} \left(y_{k,j} - \frac{w_k}{m}\right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sum_{i \in \tilde{V}} P_i^2)\phi \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} (P_i + \sum_{i \in \tilde{V}} P_i^2) \left(y_{i,j} - \frac{w_i}{m}\right) \sum_k \left(y_{k,j} - \frac{w_k}{m}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sum_{i \in \tilde{V}} P_i^2)\phi < \frac{1}{2}\phi. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from the fact that

$$\sum_k \left(y_{k,j} - \frac{w_k}{m} \right) = \sum_k y_{k,j} - \sum_k \frac{w_k}{m} = 1 - 1 = 0.$$

■

Lemma 9 *There exists a $\tau = O(\log m)$ such that after $\forall t > \tau$ rounds of Gossip-ave, $w_{t,z} \geq 2^{-\tau}$ at z , the root of the largest tree.*

Proof: In the case that the selection probability is uniform, it has been shown in [9] that on an m -clique, with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta'}{2}$, after $4 \log m + \log 2\delta'$ rounds, a message originating from any node (through a random walk on the clique) would have visited all nodes of the clique. When the distribution of the selection probability is not uniform, it is clear that a message originating from any node must have visited the node with the highest selection probability after a certain number of rounds that is greater than $4 \log m + \log 2\delta'$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta'}{2}$. ■

From the previous two lemmas, we derive the following theorem.

Theorem 10 (Diffusion speed of Gossip-ave) *With probability at least $1 - \delta'$, there exists a time $T_{ave} = O(\log m + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\delta'})$, such that $\forall t \geq T_{ave}$, the contributions at z , root of the largest tree, is nearly uniform, i.e., $\max_j \left| \frac{y_{t,z,j}}{\|\mathbf{y}_{t,z}\|_1} - \frac{1}{m} \right| = \left\| \frac{\mathbf{y}_{t,i}}{\|\mathbf{y}_{t,i}\|_1} - \frac{1}{m} \cdot \mathbf{1} \right\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$.*

Proof: By Lemma 8, we obtain that $E[\Phi_t] < (m-1)2^{-t} < m2^{-t}$, as $\Phi_0 = (m-1)$. By Lemma 9, we set $\tau = 4 \log m + \log \frac{2}{\delta'}$ and $\hat{\epsilon}^2 = \epsilon^2 \cdot \frac{\delta'}{2} \cdot 2^{-2\tau}$. Then after $t = \log m + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ rounds of Gossip-ave, $E[\Phi_t] \leq \hat{\epsilon}$. By Markov's inequality [14], with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta'}{2}$, the potential $\Phi_t \leq \epsilon^2 \cdot 2^{-2\tau}$, which guarantees that $|y_{t,i,j} - \frac{w_{t,i}}{m}| \leq \epsilon \cdot 2^{-\tau}$ for all the root nodes i .

To have $\max_j \left| \frac{y_{t,z,j}}{\|\mathbf{y}_{t,z}\|_1} - \frac{1}{m} \right| \leq \epsilon$, we need to lower bound the weight of node z . From Lemma 9, $w_{t,z} = \|\mathbf{y}_{t,z}\|_1 \geq 2^{-\tau}$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta'}{2}$. Note that Lemma 9 only applies to z , the root of the largest tree. (A root node of a relatively small tree may not be selected often enough to have such a lower bound on its weight.) Using union bound, we obtain, with probability at least $1 - \delta'$, $\max_j \left| \frac{y_{t,z,j}}{\|\mathbf{y}_{t,z}\|_1} - \frac{1}{m} \right| \leq \epsilon$. ■

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 7.

Proof of Theorem 7

Proof: From Theorem 10, with probability at least $1 - \delta'$, it is guaranteed that after $T_{ave} = O(2 \log m + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\delta'})$ rounds of Gossip-ave, at z , the root of the largest tree, $\left\| \frac{\mathbf{y}_{t,i}}{\|\mathbf{y}_{t,i}\|_1} - \frac{1}{m} \cdot \mathbf{1} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\epsilon}{m}$. Let both $\epsilon = n^{-\alpha}$ and $\delta' = n^{-\alpha}$, $\alpha > 0$, then $T_{ave} = O(2 \log m + 2\alpha \log n) = O(\log n)$.

Using Hölder's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\left| \frac{s_{t,z}}{w_{t,z}} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_j x_j \right|}{\left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_j x_j \right|} &= \frac{\left| \frac{\mathbf{y}_{t,z} \cdot \mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{y}_{t,z}\|_1} - \frac{1}{m} \cdot \mathbf{1} \cdot \mathbf{x} \right|}{\left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_j x_j \right|} = m \cdot \frac{\left| \left(\frac{\mathbf{y}_{t,z}}{\|\mathbf{y}_{t,z}\|_1} - \frac{1}{m} \cdot \mathbf{1} \right) \cdot \mathbf{x} \right|}{\left| \sum_j x_j \right|} \\ &\leq m \cdot \frac{\left\| \frac{\mathbf{y}_{t,z}}{\|\mathbf{y}_{t,z}\|_1} - \frac{1}{m} \cdot \mathbf{1} \right\|_\infty \cdot \|\mathbf{x}\|_1}{\left| \sum_j x_j \right|} \\ &\leq \epsilon \cdot \frac{\sum_j |x_j|}{\left| \sum_j x_j \right|}. \end{aligned}$$

When all x_j have the same sign, we have $\frac{\left| \frac{s_{t,z}}{w_{t,z}} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_j x_j \right|}{\left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_j x_j \right|} \leq \epsilon$. Further, we need to bound the relative error of Ave. W. l. o. g., let the *true* average of the sum of values in a tree be positive, i.e., $s_{ave} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_j x_j > 0$ and,

by definition, the *true* average of the size of a tree is also positive, i.e., $g_{ave} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_j g_j = \frac{n}{m} > 0$. Therefore, the global average *Ave* is $x_{ave} = \frac{s_{ave}}{g_{ave}}$. Since $|\frac{s_{t,z}}{w_{t,z}} - s_{ave}| \leq \epsilon s_{ave}$ and $|\frac{g_{t,z}}{w_{t,z}} - g_{ave}| \leq \epsilon g_{ave}$ we obtain

$$\hat{x}_{ave,tz} = \frac{s_{t,z}}{g_{t,z}} = \frac{\left(\frac{s_{t,z}}{w_{t,z}}\right)}{\left(\frac{g_{t,z}}{w_{t,z}}\right)} \in \left[\frac{1 - \epsilon s_{ave}}{1 + \epsilon g_{ave}}, \frac{1 + \epsilon s_{ave}}{1 - \epsilon g_{ave}} \right].$$

Set $\epsilon' = c\epsilon$, where $c = \frac{2}{(1-\epsilon)} > 2$ is bounded when $\epsilon < 1$. (For example, if $\epsilon \leq 10^{-2}$, then $c = 2.\bar{0}2$ and $\epsilon' = \frac{200}{99}\epsilon$.) We set $\epsilon = n^{-\alpha}$, and then $\epsilon' = \frac{2}{n^{\alpha-1}} \approx 2\epsilon$. Thus, with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{n^{\alpha}}$, the relative error at z is

$$\frac{|\hat{x}_{ave,tz} - x_{ave}|}{|x_{ave}|} \leq \epsilon',$$

after at most $O(\log m + 2\alpha \log n) = O(\log n)$ rounds of Gossip-ave algorithm.

The above assumption that all x_j have the same sign is just for complexity analysis but not for the execution of the gossip-ave algorithm. The gossip-ave algorithm works well without any assumption on the values of roots. In the following, we further relax this assumption and show that the upper bound on the running time is also valid when x_j are not all of the same sign.

Let $\gamma = \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} + 2\gamma \cdot \mathbf{1} > \mathbf{0}$, i.e., all $x'_j > 0$ have the same sign. It is obvious that the average aggregate of the $\mathbf{x}'$ is a simple offset of the average aggregate of the $\mathbf{x}$, i.e., $x'_{ave} = x_{ave} + 2\gamma$. Proceeding through the same data exchanging scenario in each round of the gossip-ave algorithm on $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x}'$, after t rounds, at root node z , we have the relationship between the two corresponding estimates of the average aggregates on $\mathbf{x}'$ and $\mathbf{x}$: $\hat{x}'_{ave,t,z} = \hat{x}_{ave,t,z} + 2\gamma$. The desired related error is $\frac{|\hat{x}_{ave,t,z} - x_{ave}|}{|x_{ave}|} \leq \epsilon'$. Let $\gamma = O(n^{\alpha})$ and a stricter threshold $\tilde{\epsilon} = \epsilon' \frac{|x_{ave}|}{|x_{ave} + 2\gamma|} < \epsilon'$. As all x'_j are of the same sign, whp at least $1 - \frac{1}{\delta^t}$, after $t = O(\log n + \log \frac{1}{\tilde{\epsilon}} + \log \frac{1}{\delta^t}) = O(\log n)$ rounds,

$$\frac{|\hat{x}'_{ave,t,z} - x'_{ave}|}{|x'_{ave}|} = \frac{|(\hat{x}_{ave,t,z} + 2\gamma) - (x_{ave} + 2\gamma)|}{|x_{ave} + 2\gamma|} \leq \tilde{\epsilon} = \epsilon' \frac{|x_{ave}|}{|x_{ave} + 2\gamma|}.$$

From the above equation, we conclude that

$$\frac{|\hat{x}_{ave,t,z} - x_{ave}|}{|x_{ave}|} \leq \epsilon'.$$

That is to say, running the gossip-ave algorithm on an arbitrary vector $\mathbf{x}$, whp at least $1 - \frac{1}{\delta^t}$, after $t = O(\log n + \log \frac{1}{\tilde{\epsilon}} + \log \frac{1}{\delta^t}) = O(\log n)$ rounds, the relative error of the estimate of the average aggregate is less than $\epsilon' = \frac{2}{n^{\alpha-1}} = O(n^{-\alpha})$. ■

Evaluating the performance of the gossip-ave algorithm using the criterion of relative error causes a problem when $x_{ave} = 0$ whereas the gossip-ave algorithm works well when $x_{ave} = 0$. In this case, using absolute error criterion, i.e. $|\hat{x}_{ave,t,z} - x_{ave}| = |\hat{x}_{ave,t,z}| \leq \epsilon'$ is more suitable. Here, we would show that the upper bound of running time of Theorem 7 is also valid for the case that $x_{ave} = 0$ and the performance is assessed under the absolute error criterion $|\hat{x}_{ave,t,z}| \leq \epsilon'$. By the similar technique as in the above proof, choose an offset constant $\gamma = O(n^{\alpha}) > 1$ such that $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} + \gamma \cdot \mathbf{1} > \mathbf{0}$, i.e., all $x'_j > 0$ are with the same sign. Also, let $\tilde{\epsilon} = \frac{\epsilon'}{|x'_{ave}|} = \frac{\epsilon'}{\gamma} < \epsilon'$. Proceeding through the same data exchanging scenario in each round of the gossip-ave algorithm on $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{x}'$, whp at least $1 - \frac{1}{\delta^t}$, after $t = O(\log n + \log \frac{1}{\tilde{\epsilon}} + \log \frac{1}{\delta^t}) = O(\log n)$ rounds,

$$\frac{|\hat{x}'_{ave,t,z} - x'_{ave}|}{|x'_{ave}|} = \frac{|(\hat{x}_{ave,t,z} + \gamma) - \gamma|}{\gamma} \leq \tilde{\epsilon} = \frac{\epsilon'}{\gamma}.$$

From the above equation, we have that $|\hat{x}_{ave,t,z}| \leq \epsilon'$. This concludes the mapping relationship between the relative error criterion and the absolute error criterion.

Complexity of Gossip-ave

Gossip-ave algorithm needs $O(\log m + \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}) = O(\log n)$ rounds and $m \cdot O(\log n) = O(n)$ messages for the root of the largest tree to have the global average aggregate, Ave , within a relative error of at most $\frac{2}{n^{\alpha-1}}$, $\alpha > 0$.

3.4 DRR-gossip Algorithms

Putting together our results from the previous subsections, we present Algorithm 7, DRR-gossip-max algorithm, and Algorithm 8, DRR-gossip-ave algorithm, for computing Max and Ave , respectively. To conclude from previous sections, the time complexity of DRR-gossip is $O(\log n)$ since all phases need $O(\log n)$ rounds. The message complexity is dominated by DRR algorithm in phase I which needs $O(n \log \log n)$ messages.

The DRR-gossip-ave algorithm is more involved than the DRR-gossip-max algorithm. Unlike the Gossip-max algorithm which ensures that all the roots will have Max whp, the Gossip-ave algorithm only guarantees that the root of the largest tree in terms of tree size will have the Ave whp. To ensure that all the roots have Ave whp, after the Gossip-ave algorithm, the root of the largest tree has to spread out its estimate, the Ave , by using the Data-spread algorithm where the root of the largest tree sets its estimate, the Ave , computed by the Gossip-ave algorithm, as the data to be spread out. Therefore, every root needs to know in advance whether it is the root of the largest tree. To achieve this, the Gossip-max algorithm is executed beforehand on tree sizes which are obtained from the Convergecast-sum algorithm. (Note that the Gossip-max procedure in the DRR-gossip-max algorithm is executed on the local maximums computed by the Convergecast-max algorithm.) Every root could compare the maximum tree size obtained from the Gossip-max algorithm with the size of its own tree to recognize whether it is the root of the largest tree. (Note that the Gossip-max algorithm and the Gossip-ave algorithm can not be executed simultaneously, since the Gossip-ave algorithm does not have the sampling procedure as in the Gossip-max algorithm.) Finally, every root then broadcasts the Ave obtained from the Data-spread algorithm to all its tree members.

Algorithm 7: DRR-gossip-max

Run $DRR(G)$ to obtain the forest $\mathbb{F}$.;
 Run Convergecast-max($\mathbb{F}, \mathbf{v}$).;
 Run Gossip-max($G, \mathbb{F}, \tilde{V}, \mathbf{cov}_{max}$).;
 Every root node broadcasts the Max to all nodes in its tree.;

Algorithm 8: DRR-gossip-ave

Run $DRR(G)$ algorithm to obtain the forest $\mathbb{F}$.;
 Run Convergecast-sum($\mathbb{F}, \mathbf{v}$) algorithm.;;
 Run Gossip-max($G, \mathbb{F}, \tilde{V}, \mathbf{cov}_{sum}(*, 2)$) algorithm on the sizes of trees to find the root of the largest tree. At the end of this phase, a root z will know that it is the one with the largest tree size.;;
 Run Gossip-ave($G, \mathbb{F}, \tilde{V}, \mathbf{cov}_{sum}$) algorithm.;;
 Run Data-spread($G, \mathbb{F}, \tilde{V}, Ave$) algorithm—the root of the largest tree uses its average estimate, i.e., Ave , as the value to spread.;;
 Every root broadcasts its value to all the nodes in its tree.

3.5 The complexity of DRR-gossip algorithms

To conclude from the previous sections, the time complexity of the DRR-gossip algorithms is $O(\log n)$ since all the phases need $O(\log n)$ rounds. The message complexity is dominated by the DRR algorithm in the phase I which needs $O(n \log \log n)$ messages. Thus, our DRR-gossip algorithms achieve the same time complexity as uniform gossip of [9] but reduce the message complexity to $O(n \log \log n)$. Although the efficient gossip of [8] can have the same message complexity, it will need $O(\log \log \log n)$ time.

4 Application to Sparse Networks — Local-DRR Algorithm

In sparse networks, a small number of neighbors makes it feasible for each node to send messages to all of its neighbors simultaneously in one round. In fact, this is a standard assumption in the traditional message passing distributed computing model [19] (here it is assumed messages sent to different neighbors in one round can all be different). We show how DRR-gossip can be used to improve gossip-based aggregate computation in such networks.

We assume that, in a round of time, a node of an arbitrary undirected graph can communicate directly only with its immediate neighbors (i.e., nodes that are connected directly by an edge). (Note that, in previous sections, any two nodes can communicate with each other in a round under a complete graph model.) Thus, on such a communication model, we have a variant of the DRR algorithm, called the *Local-DRR algorithm*, where a node only exchange rank information with its immediate neighbors. Each node chooses a random rank in $[0, 1]$ as before. Then each node connects to its highest ranked neighbor (i.e., the neighbor which has the highest rank among all its neighbors). A node that has the highest rank among all its neighbors will become a root. Since every node, except root nodes, connects to a node with higher rank, there is no cycle in the graph. Thus this process results in a collection of disjoint trees. As shown in Theorem 11 below, the key property is that the *height* of each tree produced by the Local-DRR algorithm on an *arbitrary* graph is bounded by $O(\log n)$ whp. This enables us to bound the time complexity of the Phase II of the DRR-gossip algorithm, i.e., Convergcst and Broadcast, on an arbitrary graph by $O(\log n)$ whp.

Theorem 11 *On an arbitrary undirected graph, all the trees produced by the Local-DRR algorithm have a height of at most $O(\log n)$ whp.*

Proof: Fix any node u_0 . We first show that the path from u_0 to a root is at most $O(\log n)$ whp. Let $u_1, u_2, \dots$ be the successive ancestors of u_0 , i.e., u_1 is the parent of u_0 (i.e., u_0 connects to u_1), u_2 is the parent of u_1 and so on. (Note $u_1, u_2, \dots$ are all null if u_0 itself is the root). Define the complement value to the rank of u_i as $C_i := 1 - \text{rank}(u_i)$, $i \geq 0$. The main thrust of the proof is to show that the sequence C_i , $i \geq 0$ decreases geometrically whp. We adapt a technique used in [15].

For $t \geq 0$, let I_t be the indicator random variable for the event that a root has not been reached after t jumps, i.e., $u_0, u_1, \dots, u_t$ are not roots. We need the following Lemma.

Lemma 12 *For any $t \geq 1$ and any $z \in [0, 1]$, $E[C_{t+1}I_t | C_t I_{t-1} = z] \leq z/2$.*

Proof: We can assume that $z \neq 0$; since $C_{t+1} \leq C_t$ and $I_t \leq I_{t-1}$, the lemma holds trivially if $z = 0$. Therefore, we have $I_{t-1} = 1$ and $C_t = z > 0$. We focus on the node u_t . Denote the set of neighbors of node u_t by U ; the size of U is at most $n - 1$. Let Y be the random variable denoting the number of “unexplored” nodes in set U , i.e., those that do not belong to the set $\{u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{t-1}\}$. If $Y = 0$, then u_t is a root and hence $C_{t+1}I_t = 0$. We will prove that for all $d \geq 1$,

$$E[C_{t+1}I_t | ((C_t I_{t-1} = z) \wedge (Y = d))] \leq z/2. \quad (3)$$

Showing the above is enough to prove the lemma, because if the lemma holds conditional on all positive values of d , it also holds unconditionally. For convenience, we denote the l.h.s. of (3) as Φ .

Fix some $d \geq 1$. In all arguments below, we condition on the event “ $(C_t I_{t-1} = z) \wedge (Y = d)$ ”. Let $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_d$ denote the d unexplored nodes in U . If $\text{rank}(v_i) < \text{rank}(u_t)$ for all i ($1 \leq i \leq d$), then u_t is a

root and hence $C_{t+1}I_t = 0$. Therefore, conditioning on the value $y = \min_i C_i = \min_i (1 - \text{rank}(v_i)) \leq z$, and considering the d possible values of i that achieve this minimum, we get,

$$\Phi = d \int_0^z y(1-y)^{d-1} dy.$$

Evaluating the above yields

$$\Phi = \frac{1 - (1-z)^d(1+zd)}{(d+1)}.$$

We can show that the r.h.s of the above is at most $z/2$ by a straightforward induction on d . $\blacksquare$

Using Lemma 12, we now prove Theorem 11.

We have $E[C_1 I_0] \leq E[C_1] \leq 1$. Hence by Lemma 12 and an induction on t yields that $E[C_t I_{t-1}] \leq 2^{-t}$. In particular, letting $T = 3 \log n$, where c is some suitable constant, we get $E[C_T I_{T-1}] \leq n^{-3}$.

Now, suppose $u_T = u$ and that $C_T I_{T-1} = z$. The degree of node u is at most n ; for each of these nodes v , $\Pr(\text{rank}(v) > \text{rank}(u)) = \Pr(1 - \text{rank}(v) < 1 - \text{rank}(u)) = \Pr(1 - \text{rank}(v) < z) = z$. Thus the probability that u is not a root is at most nz ; more formally, $\forall z, \Pr(I_T = 1 | C_T I_{T-1} = z) \leq nz$. So,

$$\Pr(I_T = 1) \leq \log n E[C_T I_{T-1}] \leq n/n^3 = 1/n^2.$$

Hence, whp, the number of hops from any fixed node to the root is $O(\log n)$. By union bound, the statement holds for all nodes whp. $\blacksquare$

Similar to Theorem 2, we can bound the number of trees produced by the Local-DRR algorithm on an arbitrary graph.

Theorem 13 *Let G be an arbitrary connected undirected graph having n nodes. Let $d_i = O(n/\log n)$ be the degree of node i , $1 \leq i \leq n$. The number of trees produced by the Local-DRR algorithm is $O(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i+1})$ whp. Hence, if $d_i = d$, $\forall i$, then the number of trees is $O(n/d)$ whp.*

Proof: Let the indicator random variable X_i take the value of 1 if node i is a root and 0 otherwise. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ be the total number of roots. $\Pr(X_i = 1) = 1/(d_i + 1)$ since, this is the probability its value is the highest among all of its d_i neighbors. Hence, by linearity of expectation, the expected number of roots (hence, trees) is $E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^n E[X_i] = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i+1}$. To show concentration, we cannot directly use a standard Chernoff bound since X_i s are not independent (connections are not independently chosen, but fixed by the underlying graph). However, one can use the following variant of the Chernoff bound from [18] (cf. Lemma 1), which works in the case of dependent indicator random variables that are correlated as defined below. For random variables, $X_1, \dots, X_i, \dots, X_n$ and for any $S_{i-1} \subseteq \{1, \dots, i-1\}$, $\Pr(X_i = 1 | \bigwedge_{j \in S_{i-1}} X_j = 1) \leq \Pr(X_i = 1)$. This is because if a node's neighbor is a root, then the probability that the node itself is a root is 0. Also, the assumption of $d_i = O(n/\log n)$ ensures that $E[X]$ is $\Omega(\log n)$, so the Chernoff bound yields a high probability on the concentration of X to its mean $E[X]$. $\blacksquare$

We make two assumptions regarding the network communication model: (1) as mentioned earlier, a node can send a message simultaneously to all its neighbors (i.e., nodes that are connected directly by an edge) in the same round; (2) there is a routing protocol which allows any node to communicate with a *random* node in the network in $O(T)$ rounds and using $O(M)$ messages whp. Assumption (1) is standard in distributed computing literature [2, 19]. As for Assumption (2), there are well-known techniques for sampling a random node in a network, e.g., using random walks (e.g., [26]) or using special properties of the underlying topology, e.g., as in P2P topologies such as Chord [10]. Under the above assumptions, we obtain the performance of DRR-gossip using the Local-DRR algorithm on sparse graphs in the following Theorem.

Theorem 14 *On a d -regular graph $G(V, E)$, where $|V| = n$ and $d = O(n/\log n)$, the time complexity of the DRR-gossip algorithms is $O(\log n + T \log \frac{n}{d})$ whp by using the Local-DRR algorithm and a routing protocol running in $O(T)$ rounds and $O(M)$ messages (whp) between a gossip pair; the corresponding message complexity is $O(|E| + \frac{n}{d} M \log \frac{n}{d})$ whp.*

Proof: Phase I (Local-DRR) takes $O(1)$ time, since each node can find its largest ranked neighbor in constant time (Assumption 1) and needs $O(|E|)$ messages in total (since at most two messages travel through an edge). Phase II (convergecast and broadcast) takes $O(\log n)$ time (by Theorem 12 and Assumption 1) and $O(n)$ messages. Phase III (uniform gossip) takes $O(T \log \frac{n}{d})$ time (Assumption 2) and needs $O(\frac{n}{d} M \log \frac{n}{d})$ messages (Assumption 2 and Theorem 13). ■

We can apply the above theorem to Chord [25]. Each node in Chord has a degree $d = O(\log n)$. Chord admits an efficient (non-trivial) protocol (cf. [10]) which satisfies Assumption (2) with $T = O(\log n)$ and $M = O(\log n)$ (both in expectation, which is sufficient here). Hence the above theorem shows that DRR-gossip takes $O(\log^2 n)$ time and $O(n \log n)$ messages whp. In contrast, the straightforward uniform gossip [9] gives $O(T \log n) = O(\log^2 n)$ rounds and $O(M \cdot n \log n) = O(n \log^2 n)$ messages whp.

5 Lower Bound for Address-Oblivious Algorithms

We conclude by showing a non-trivial lower bound result on gossip-based aggregate computation: any address-oblivious algorithm for computing aggregates requires $\Omega(n \log n)$ messages, *regardless of the number of rounds or the size of the (individual) messages*. We assume the random phone call model: i.e., communication partners are chosen randomly (without depending on their addresses). The following theorem gives a lower bound for computing the Max aggregate. The argument can be adapted for other aggregates as well.

Theorem 15 *Any address-oblivious algorithm that computes the Maximum value, Max , in a n -node network needs $\Omega(n \log n)$ messages whp (regardless of the number of rounds).*

Proof: We lower bound the number of messages exchanged between nodes before a large fraction of the nodes correctly knows the (correct) maximum value. Suppose nodes can send messages that are arbitrary long. (The bound will hold regardless of this assumption.) Without loss of generality, we will assume that a node can send a list of all node addresses and the corresponding node values learned so far (without any aggregation). For any node i to have correct knowledge of the maximum, it should somehow know the values at all other nodes. (Otherwise, an adversary—who knows the random choices made by the algorithm—can always make sure that the maximum is at a node which is not known by i .) There are two ways that i can learn about another node j 's value: (1) direct way: i gets to know j 's value by communicating with j directly (at the beginning, each node knows only about its own value); and (2) indirect way: i gets to know j 's value by communicating with a node $w \neq j$ which has a knowledge of j 's value. Note that w itself may have learned about j 's value either directly or indirectly.

Let v_i be the (initial) value associated with node i , $1 \leq i \leq n$. We will assume that all values are *distinct*. By the adversary argument, the requirement is that at the end of any algorithm, on the average, at least half of the nodes should know (in the above direct or indirect way) all of the v_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$. Otherwise, the adversary can make that value that is not known to more than half of the nodes, the maximum. We want to show that the number of messages needed to satisfy the above requirement is at least $cn \log n$, for some (small) constant $c > 0$. In fact, we show something stronger: at least $cn \log n$ (for some small $c > 0$) messages are needed if we require even $n^{\Omega(1)}$ values to be known to at least $\Omega(n)$ nodes.

We define a stage (consisting of one or more rounds) as follows. Stage 1 starts with round 1. If stage t ends in round j , then stage $t + 1$ starts in round $j + 1$. Thus, it remains to describe when a stage ends. We distinguish sparse and dense stages. A sparse stage contains at most ϵn messages (for a suitably chosen small constant $\epsilon > 0$, fixed later in the proof). The length of these stages is maximized, i.e., a sparse stage ends in a round j if adding round $j + 1$ to the stage would result in more than ϵn messages. A dense stage consists of only one round containing more than ϵn messages. Observe that the number of messages during the stages 0 to j is at least $(j - 1)\epsilon n/2$ because any pair of consecutive stages contains at least ϵn messages by construction.

Let $S_i(t)$ be the set of *nodes* that know v_i at the beginning of stage t . At the beginning of stage 1, $|S_i(1)| = 1$, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

At the beginning of stage t , we call a value as *typical* if it is known by at most $6^t \log n$ nodes (i.e., $|S_i(t)| \leq 6^t \log n$) and it was typical at the beginning of all stages prior to t . All values are typical at the beginning of stage 1. Let k_t denote the number of typical values at the beginning of stage t .

The proof of the Theorem follows from the following claim. (Constants specified will be fixed in the proof; we don't try to optimize these values).

Claim: At the beginning of stage t , at least $(1/6)^t n$ values are typical w.h.p., for all $t \leq \delta \log n$, for a fixed positive constant δ .

The above claim will imply the theorem since at the end of stage $t = \delta \log n$, $|S_i(t)| \leq o(n)$ for at least $n^{\Omega(1)}$ values, i.e., at least $n^{\Omega(1)}$ values are not yet known to $1 - o(1)$ fraction of the nodes after stage $t = \delta \log n$. Hence the number of messages needed is at least $\Omega(n \log n)$.

We prove the above claim by induction: We show that if the claim holds at the beginning of a stage then it hold at the end of the stage. We show this regardless whether the stage is dense or sparse, and thus we have two cases.

Case 1: The stage is dense. A dense stage consists of only one round with at least ϵn messages. Fix a typical value v_i . Let $U_i(t) = V - S_i(t)$, i.e., the set of nodes that do not know v_i at the beginning of stage t . For $1 \leq k(i) \leq |U_i(t)|$, let $x_{k(i)}$ denote the indicator random variable that denotes whether the $k(i)$ th of these nodes gets to know the value v_i in this stage. Let $X_i(t) = \sum_{k(i)=1}^{|U_i(t)|} x_{k(i)}$. Let u be a node that does not know v_i . u can get to know v_i either by calling a node that knows the value or being called by a node that knows the value. The probability it gets to know v_i by calling is at most $6^t \log n/n$ and the probability that it gets called by a node knowing the value is at most $6^t \log n/n$ (this quantity is $o(1)$, since $t \leq \delta \log n$ and δ is sufficiently small). Hence the total probability that it gets to know v_i is at most $2 \cdot 6^t \log n/n$. Thus, the expected number of nodes that get to know v_i in this stage is $E[X_i(t)] = \sum_{k(i)=1}^{|U_i(t)|} \Pr\{x_{k(i)} = 1\} \leq 2 \cdot 6^t \log n$. The variables $x_{k(i)}$ are not independent, but are negatively correlated in the sense of Lemma 1 and using the Chernoff bound of this Lemma we have:

$$\Pr(X_i(t) > 5 \cdot 6^t \log n) = \Pr(X_i(t) > (1 + 3/2) \cdot 2 \cdot 6^t \log n) \leq 1/n^2.$$

By union bound, w.h.p., at most $5 \cdot 6^t$ new nodes get to know each typical value. Thus w.h.p. the total number of nodes knowing a typical value (for every such value) in this stage is at most $6^t \log n + 5 \cdot 6^t \log n = 6^{t+1} \log n$, thus satisfying the induction hypothesis. It also follows that a typical value at the beginning of a dense phase remains typical at the end of the phase, i.e., $k_{t+1} = k_t$ w.h.p.

Case 2: The stage is sparse. By definition, there are at most ϵn messages in a sparse stage. Each of these messages can be a push or a pull. A sparse stage may consist of multiple rounds.

Fix a typical value v_i . W.h.p, there are at most $6^t \log n$ nodes that know a typical value at the beginning of this stage. Using pull messages, since the origin is chosen uniformly at random, the probability that one of these nodes is contacted is at most $1/n(\epsilon n) = \epsilon$. Hence the expected number of messages sent by nodes knowing this typical value is at most $\epsilon 6^t \log n$. Thus the expected number of new nodes that get to know this typical value is at most $\epsilon 6^t \log n$. The high probability bound can be shown as earlier.

We next consider the effect of push messages. We focus on values that are typical at the beginning of this stage. We show that high probability at least some constant fraction of the typical values remain typical at the end of this phase. As defined earlier, let k_t be the number of such typical values. In this stage, at most ϵn nodes are involved in pushing — let this set be Q . Consider a random typical value x . Since a typical value is known by at most $6^t \log n$ nodes and destinations are uniformly randomly chosen, the probability that x is known to a node in Q is $O(\frac{6^t \log n}{n})$. Hence the expected number of times that x will be pushed by set Q is at most $O(\epsilon 6^t \log n)$. Now, the number of times x has to be pushed is at least $(6 - \epsilon) \cdot 6^t \log n$ to exceed the required expansion for this value whp (as argued in the above para, pulling only results in at most $\epsilon 6^t \log n$ messages having being sent out w.h.p). By Markov's inequality, the probability that x is pushed more than $(6 - \epsilon) \cdot 6^t \log n$ times by nodes in set Q is at most $\frac{\epsilon}{6 - \epsilon}$. Hence the expected number of typical values that can expand is at most $\frac{\epsilon}{6 - \epsilon} k_t$. Thus, in expectation, at least $1 - \frac{\epsilon}{6 - \epsilon}$ fraction of the typical values remain typical. High probability bound can be shown similar to case 1. We want $1 - \frac{\epsilon}{6 - \epsilon} > 1/6$, for the induction hypothesis

to hold; this can be satisfied by choosing ϵ small enough. ■

6 Concluding Remarks

We presented an almost-optimal gossip-based protocol for computing aggregates that takes $O(n \log \log n)$ messages and $O(\log n)$ rounds. We also showed how our protocol can be applied to improve performance in networks with a fixed underlying topology. The main technical ingredient of our approach is a simple distributed randomized procedure called DRR to partition a network into trees of small size. The improved bounds come at the cost of sacrificing address-obliviousness. However, as we show in our lower bound, this is necessary if we need to break the $\Omega(n \log n)$ message barrier. An interesting open question is to establish whether $\Omega(n \log \log n)$ messages is a lower bound for gossip-based aggregate computation in the non-address oblivious model. Another interesting direction is to see whether the DRR technique can be used to obtain improved bounds for other distributed computing problems.

References

- [1] Stephen Boyd, Arpita Ghosh, Balaji Prabhakar, and Devavrat Shah, *Randomized gossip algorithms*, IEEE Trans. on Information Theory **52** (2006), no. 6, 2508–2530.
- [2] Jen-Yeu Chen, Gopal Pandurangan, and Dongyan Xu, *Robust aggregate computation in wireless sensor network: distributed randomized algorithms and analysis*, IEEE Trans. on Paral. and Dist. Sys. (TPDS) **17** (Sep. 2006), no. 9, 987–1000.
- [3] Alan Demers, Dan Greene, Carl Hauser, Wes Irish, John Larson, Scott Shenker, Howard Sturgis, Dan Swinehart, and Doug Terry, *Epidemic algorithms for replicated database maintenance*, PODC, 1987, pp. 1–12.
- [4] Alexandros G. Dimakis, Anand D. Sarwate, and Martin J. Wainwright, *Geographic gossip: efficient aggregation for sensor networks*, IPSN, 2006, pp. 69–76.
- [5] Jie Gao, Leonidas Guibas, Nikola Milosavljevic, and John Hersherberger, *Sparse data aggregation in sensor networks*, IPSN, 2007, pp. 430–439.
- [6] Márk Jelasity, Alberto Montresor, and Ozalp Babaoglu, *Gossip-based aggregation in large dynamic networks*, ACM Trans. Comput. Syst. **23** (2005), no. 3, 219–252.
- [7] Richard M. Karp, Christian Schindelhauer, Scott Shenker, and Berthold Vöcking, *Randomized rumor spreading*, FOCS, 2000, pp. 565–574.
- [8] Srinivas Kashyap, Supratim Deb, K. V. M. Naidu, Rajeev Rastogi, and Anand Srinivasan, *Efficient gossip-based aggregate computation*, PODS, 2006, pp. 308–317.
- [9] David Kempe, Alin Dobra, and Johannes Gehrke, *Gossip-based computation of aggregate information*, FOCS, 2003, pp. 482–491.
- [10] Valerie King, Scott Lewis, Jared Saia, and Maxwell Young, *Choosing a random peer in chord*, Algorithmica **49** (2007), no. 2, 147–169.
- [11] Bhaskar Krishnamachari, Deborah Estrin, and Stephen B. Wicker, *The impact of data aggregation in wireless sensor networks*, DEBS, 2002, pp. 575–578.
- [12] Pradeep Kyasanur, Romit Roy Choudhury, and Indranil Gupta, *Smart gossip: An adaptive gossip-based broadcasting service for sensor networks*, MASS, 2006, pp. 91–100.

- [13] Samuel Madden, Michael J. Franklin, Joseph M. Hellerstein, and Wei Hong, *Tag: a tiny aggregation service for ad-hoc sensor networks*, SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev. **36** (2002), no. SI, 131–146.
- [14] Michael Mitzenmacher and Eli Upfal, *Probability and computing*, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [15] Ruggero Morselli, Bobby Bhattacharjee, Michael A. Marsh, and Aravind Srinivasan, *Efficient lookup on unstructured topologies*, PODC, 2005, pp. 77–86.
- [16] Damon Mosk-Aoyama and Devavrat Shah, *Computing separable functions via gossip*, PODC, 2006, pp. 113–122.
- [17] Suman Nath, Phillip B. Gibbons, Srinivasan Seshan, and Zachary R. Anderson, *Synopsis diffusion for robust aggregation in sensor networks*, SenSys, 2004, pp. 250–262.
- [18] A. Panconesi and A. Srinivasan, *Randomized distributed edge coloring via an extension of the Chernoff-Hoeffding bounds*, SIAM Journal on Computing **26** (1997), 350–368.
- [19] David Peleg, *Distributed computing: A locality-sensitive approach*, SIAM, 2000.
- [20] Roberto Di Pietro and Pietro Michiardi, *Brief announcement: Gossip-based aggregate computation: computing faster with non address-oblivious schemes*, PODC, 2008, page 442, Extended version at http://www.eurecom.fr/~michiard/downloads/podc08_a_ext.pdf.
- [21] Boris Pittel, *On spreading a rumor*, SIAM J. Appl. Math. **47** (1987), no. 1, 213–223.
- [22] Antony I. T. Rowstron and Peter Druschel, *Pastry: Scalable, decentralized object location, and routing for large-scale peer-to-peer systems*, Middleware, 2001, pp. 329–350.
- [23] Rik Sarkar, Xianjin Zhu, and Jie Gao, *Hierarchical spatial gossip for multi-resolution representation in sensor network*, IPSN, 2007, pp. 420–429.
- [24] Nisheeth Shrivastava, Chiranjeev Buragohain, Divyakant Agrawal, and Subhash Suri, *Medians and beyond: new aggregation techniques for sensor networks*, SenSys, 2004, pp. 239–249.
- [25] Ion Stoica, Robert Morris, David Karger, M. Frans Kaashoek, and Hari Balakrishnan, *Chord: A scalable peer-to-peer lookup service for internet applications*, SIGCOMM, 2001, pp. 149–160.
- [26] Ming Zhong and Kai Shen, *Random walk based node sampling in self-organizing networks*, SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev. **40** (2006), no. 3, 49–55.